



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,025	12/20/2000	Elizabeth Rosenzweig	80996DMW	8124

7590

06/29/2005

Thomas H. Close
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

SAX, STEVEN PAUL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/745,025

Applicant(s)

ROSENZWEIG ET AL.

Examiner

Steven P Sax

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. The amendment filed 3/31/05 has been entered.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-10, 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain et al (6567980) and Takemoto (6335742) and Tomat et al (6784925).

4. Regarding claim 1, Jain et al show a GUI adapted to browse pictures stored in a picture database (column 2 lines 10-20, column 4 lines 20-35), including: a main level display providing links to other display levels (Figure 2), which has a main display area adapted to display pictures, thumbnails, and graphical browsers (Figure 2 element 172, element 202, column 4 lines 20-40), a picture content iconic region having icons representing pictures according to predefined content categories and picture metadata (Figures 14, 17, column 14 lines 27-65), and a content category selection area adapted to allow selection of a content category (column 13 lines 25-48, column 14 lines 25-55, Figure 17), and further having a plurality of display levels linked to the main display level

Art Unit: 2174

via one or more icons (Figure 17, column 13 lines 1-33). Jain et al show a picture grouping iconic region indicating files containing pictures in a database (Figure 17) for picture grouping with respect to the common content category, but do not show this as being hierarchical with all the directories and folders. However Takemoto does have a selectable hierarchical directory region (Figure 9 for example) for picture grouping. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Jain et al, because it would allow a convenient way to group pictures. Neither Jain et al nor Takemoto specifically show that the icons represent display levels and that these levels are accessed via the icons, but Jain et al do mention grouping icons. Furthermore Tomat et al do show this (Figures 9, 6, 13, 22, 27, 38, 51, column 2 lines 15-40, column 15 lines 30-55) for efficient grouping of pictures. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in the combination suggested by Jain et al and Takemoto, because it would provide a convenient way for efficient grouping of pictures.

5. Regarding claim 3, the content categories include picture capture data (Jain et al column 11 lines 50-65).

6. Regarding claim 4, the content categories include picture caption location (Jain et al column 13 lines 43-50).

Art Unit: 2174

7. Regarding claim 5, the content categories include predefined events (Jain et al column 7 lines 1-15).

8. Regarding claim 6, the content categories include persons (Figure 2).

9. Regarding claim 7, Jain et al and Takemoto do not specifically say the browsers are geographic maps, but Examiner takes Official Notice that geographic maps may be displayed on browsers. Furthermore, Jain et al do mention displaying Global Positioning data (column 7 lines 1-15). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have the geographic map in Jain et al, because it would provide a convenient way to display Global Positioning data.

10. Regarding claim 8, the browser may be a timeline (Jain et al column 6 lines 25-50).

11. Regarding claim 9, Jain et al and Takemoto do not specifically mention the scatter plot, but Examiner takes Official Notice that a scatter plot may be displayed. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Jain et al, because it would provide a convenient way to display picture data.

12. Regarding claim 10, the browsers include people based graphical representations based on picture metadata (Figures 2, 17).

13. Regarding claim 20, Jain et al show a graphical browser region having indicia of graphical browsers utilized by the GUI (Figure 17).

14. Regarding claims 21 and 22, these show the same features as claims 1 and 6 respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons.

15. Regarding claim 23, in addition to that mentioned for claim 1, Tomat et al show that the icons are activatable to cause the display level to be displayed with the pictures having the associated content (Figures 9, 6, 13, 22, 27, 38, 51, column 2 lines 15-40, column 15 lines 30-55) and the obviousness to have this in the invention suggested by Jain et al and Takemoto combined is brought out in paragraph 4 of this Office Action.

16. Claims 2, 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain et al (6567980) and Takemoto (6335742), Tomat et al (6784925), and Balogh et al (5493677).

17. Regarding claim 2, in addition to the aforementioned for claim 1, Jain et al and Takemoto and Tomat et al do not go into the details of displaying the search word indicia and word search area with methodologies, but Jain et al do mention grouping and accessing pictures by metadata (aforecited passages). Furthermore, Balogh et al do show displaying the search word indicia and word search area with methodologies to

Art Unit: 2174

group and access pictures by metadata (column 6 lines 45-67, column 7 lines 1-30). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in the combination suggested by Jain et al, Takemoto, and Tomat et al, because it would allow convenient grouping and accessing pictures by metadata.

18. Regarding claims 11-18, these show the features of claim 2 plus the features of claims 3-10 respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons as claim 2 and the reasons for claims 3-10 respectively.

19. Regarding claim 19, in addition to that mentioned for claim 2, Balogh et al show that these methodologies in fact include Boolean searches (column 7 lines 15-29).

20. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Jain et al do show the content selection area, which would select the particular file associated with the common content. Furthermore, Takemoto brings out the hierarchical selection region, which in combination with Jain et al and then with Tomat et al, bring out the linking to display levels. Applicant is invited to contact Examiner to discuss claim interpretation.

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven P Sax whose telephone number is (571) 272-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



STEVEN SAX
PRIMARY EXAMINER